

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-11, 13-19 and 22-32 are all the claims pending in the application.

Preliminary Matters

The Examiner asserts that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on April 3, 2007, fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the IDS does not include a concise explanation of the relevance of the two non-patent literature Japanese references cited therein ("Inter-Q: Providing Advertising Display Functions to Providers" and "Hot Spots That Can Turn a Street Corner into an Office"). The Examiner further asserts that the reference "Hot Spots That Can Turn a Street Corner into an Office" does not have pages 26-44 as cited in the IDS.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the translation of relevant portions of the Japanese Office Action of February 2, 2007 which was submitted with the April 3, 2008 IDS is sufficient to meet the concise explanation of relevance requirement. Section 609.04(a)(III) of the MPEP clearly states that "Where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, **the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report** or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office. This may be an explanation of which portion of the reference is particularly relevant, to which claims it applies, or merely an "X", "Y", or "A" indication on a search report." The submitted translation clearly indicates that the reference of

“Inter-Q: Providing Advertising Display Functions to Providers” is relevant with regard to advertising. Additionally, the submitted translation clearly indicates that the reference “Hot Spots That Can Turn a Street Corner into an Office” does not constitute a region for rejection. This suggests that the foreign office considered it to be an “A” reference. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, pages 26-44 of “Hot Spots That Can Turn a Street Corner into an Office” are provided, as evidenced by the page numbers on the bottom right hand corner of the submitted document.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the submitted IDS of April 3, 2008 complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3).

Claim Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects claim 6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In view of the self-explanatory amendments to claims 6 and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19 and 21-32 stand rejected. Specifically, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 15-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Takada et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0089931; hereinafter “Takada”) and claims 5-7, 21-23 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takada in view of Applicant’s admitted prior art Jun

(JP 2002-266018). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 is amended to recite the subject matter of claim 5, and recites “An internet connection service providing method, comprising: presetting a service class, among a plurality of service classes, for a user, wherein said service class is selected by the user, authenticating said user, when logging-in to a network, according to said preset service class for said user, recognizing said preset service class for said user, and providing a service, corresponding to the recognized service class, to said user, wherein advertisement data, which have been preliminarily received from an advertisement requester and accumulated, are distributed to said user in correspondence to said service class”.

The Examiner acknowledges that Takada fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature of “advertisement data, which have been preliminarily received from an advertisement requester and accumulated, are distributed to said user in correspondence to said service class,” and instead relies on Jun.

Jun discloses, with respect to drawing 1, base transceiver stations 3 which are installed in a vender Q store site, and are “used in order that the vendor Q may transmit own servicing information to the customer P, and are connected with the consumer premises equipment 2” via wireless network N₁ (paragraph 27). Jun then discloses that various programs, “such as data of each vender’s Q original advertisement information, etc. and...for transmitting the predetermined information and various messages of goods to the customer P according to the

demand from the consumer premises equipment 2,” (paragraph 30). That is, when a customer P “demands” advertisement data, the vender Q provides the data. Accordingly, customer P will become possible [accessing the Internet for nothing]” (paragraph 31). However, Jun fails to teach or even remotely suggest distributing advertisement data to a user **in correspondence to a service class**. Jun discloses uniformly transmitting advertisement data merely based on a “demand” from the customer. Jun fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed feature of “advertisement data, which have been preliminarily received from an advertisement requester and accumulated, are distributed to said user in correspondence to said service class,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Applicant further submits that claims 2-3, 6-11 and 13-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 17 is amended and recites one or more features analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable at least for reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that claims 18-19 and 22-32 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 17.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rohit K. Krishna/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Rohit K. Krishna
Registration No. 62,474

Date: August 8, 2008